DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 393 816 SP 036 561

AUTHOR Veugelers, Wiel
TITLE Teachers, Value Stimulation, and Critical Thinking.
PUB DATE 22 Apr 95
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 18-22, 1995).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Critical Thinking; Educational Environment; *Educational Strategies; Foreign Countries; Intellectual Disciplines; *Moral Values; Secondary Education; *Secondary School Teachers; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Role; Teacher Student Relationship; *Values Education
IDENTIFIERS *Netherlands; Pedagogical Content Knowledge

ABSTRACT

Two studies have explored how teachers in the Netherlands think about value stimulation and how teachers combine stimulating the development of specific values with teaching skills that enable students to adopt critical thinking or to analyze various opinions. The results of an investigation into the importance attached by teachers to stimulating and developing certain values, using the example of values regarding labor, are presented. A written questionnaire was sent to 694 teachers in general secondary education and vocational education (415 responded). The instrument asked teachers to indicate how much importance they attached to each of the specified education goals, how much attention they paid to each goal, and why they had chosen these goals. Results showed that these teachers not only passed on knowledge and skills to their students but they also stimulated them in developing certain values related to work. In addition, the subject matter, personal characteristics, and culture of the school all had an influence on the specific values teachers stimulated in their students. In order to examine teachers' didactic approach to these pedagogical tasks, another study in progress has examined the connection between stimulating certain values by teachers and students' learning how to think critically. So far this research has found that when teachers teach a value-loaded topic they often follow a progression of steps: first not expressing their own values, then stressing differences in values without expressing the values they find important, and finally indicating the values they themselves find important. Because stimulating certain values seems to be characteristic of the teaching profession, it is proposed that teachers make explicit which values are included in their pedagogical content knowledge. It is also important to examine what teachers do when they try to develop critical thinking skills in their students and at the same time wish to develop certain values. (Contains 40 references.) (JB)

ED 393 816

TEACHERS, VALUE STIMULATION, AND CRITICAL THINKING

WIEL VEUGELERS

UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM

Paper presented at the AERA-conference
San Francisco 1995

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF TEACHING AND LEARNING
FACULTY OF EDUCATIONAL STUDIES
UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM
HERENGRACHT 256
1016 BV AMSTERDAM
the NETHERLANDS
Tel. 31 20 525 3541/1256
Fax 31 20 525 3709

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
W. Veugelers
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SP036561

Introduction

Education has a pedagogical task, which means that education intends to develop certain values in students. This task stems from the role played by education in the transfer of culture, in socializing the youth in order to help them function in society. Whose culture should be passed on in education and for what kind of society should students be prepared is partly laid down in governmental documents and curricula. But each school, and all the teachers have some freedom to give their own interpretation to the values they want to develop in their students. Teachers are the ones that shape the pedagogical task. A teacher tries to stimulate the development of specific values in his/her students.

The questions that will be answered in this paper are 'How do teachers think about value stimulation?' and 'How do teachers combine stimulating the development of specific values with teaching skills that enable students to adopt critical thinking, that is, analyze various opinions on their value orientation. This paper intends to offer a perspective on a didactic approach in which learning cognitive strategies by students are influenced by forms of instruction in which teachers stimulate the development of specific values.

The values a teacher wishes to develop in his/her students are expressed in the pedagogical content knowledge of that teacher (Gudmundsdottir, 1990), in his or her interpretation of the curriculum (Goodlad, Klein and Tye 1979). Teachers stimulate these values via subject matter, chosen examples and reactions to their students.

Teachers may chiefly stimulate these values implicitly through a hidden curriculum (Giroux and Purpel, 1983), but they can also be aware of the values they stimulate and of the way they do this or, at least, they might have an idea in this respect. Teachers can also make explicit to their students which values they are stimulating.

From a constructivistic point of view (Prawatt, 1992) it can be stated that students develop their values themselves, giving their own interpretation to the process of signification. A teacher tries to influence this process of signification (McLaren, 1994; Veugelers, 1989). Therefore we use the term of 'value stimulation' (Veugelers, 1993).

A totally different way of handling values is advocated in the approach dealing with the development of critical thinking skills. Essential in this approach is that students learn how to analyze their own views and opinions and also other people's opinions on their value orientation (Kennedy, Fisher and Ennis, 1991; Paul, 1992). In this approach the teacher tries to fit his students out with certain skills that enable them to explain certain values, communicate them, and make logical analyses of the various opinions. In these didactic approaches teachers are expected to adopt a neutral attitude toward the values concerned.

Also, in a great deal of approaches dealing with moral education it is assumed that teachers are only structuring the learning process of their students, and that they will function in a value-neutral way, for example, in 'value clarification' (Raths, Harmin and Simon, 1966) and in the work of Kohlberg. In our opinion, the 'moral judgment' approach (Oser, 1994; Power, Higgins and Kohlberg, 1991), in which students are taught to develop

their own values based on the analysis of dilemmas is also a way of teaching students to think critically.

In teaching students to think critically the didactic approach is apparently completely at odds with the didactic approach used in stimulating values.

The values teachers wish to stimulate and the way in which they handle different values in their teaching are influenced by their view on education and didactic activities, but also by the age of their students. We are mainly interested in the age group of 15-18 year olds, the age when the development of youngsters' identity begins to manifest itself more obviously. Moreover, this is the last phase in which all students can be socialized via education.

Pedagogical task of education and cognitive strategies

In the Netherlands, but also in most Western countries, the pedagogical task of education has been stressed once more recently (Edwards, Munn and Fogelman, 1994). In the Netherlands, for instance, this has been done by politicians, educational scientists and pedagogues. For teachers this means not only that they must pay attention to the development of values, but also that they must develop specific values. This emphasis on the pedagogical task of education is the result of the shift in educational discourse occurring in the eighties.

In the sixties and seventies the emphasis in educational discourse and educational practice was laid on personal development and sociocultural education. Education had to pay more attention to individual creative possibilities and prepare students for future democratic participation in the community. In the eighties, the political and social discourse in Western societies changed and, according to the critics, education was becoming 'a provision for welfare'. The socioeconomic task, i.e. preparing students for practicing a profession and for participating in the workforce had to be given more attention.

According to the critics, the emphasis on personal development and sociocultural education in the sixties and the seventies also undervalued the acquisition of knowledge and skills in education. The 'back-to-basic' movement in the eighties stressed therefore the importance of acquiring knowledge and skills. In the nineties, another shift has been occurring in the educational discourse. According to the policy pursued by most Western European countries and by the United States education should, once again, enhance its pedagogical task. The goal of education nowadays is not only to impart knowledge and skills but also to develop certain values.

Another topic in restructuring education is the introduction of thinking skills, cognitive strategies, self-regulated learning, higher order thinking and critical thinking in the curriculum (Van Hout-Wolters, 1992; Marzano, 1992). These concepts have in common that students must learn how they can organize their own learning process. They must acquire the cognitive strategies that enable them to construct their own knowledge. In value

education, cognitive strategies for critical thinking are important. In this paper we shall concentrate on the way in which students are confronted with teachers' values when they learn cognitive strategies for critical thinking. From the perspective of teachers we shall look at the way in which the values they want to stimulate in students find their way in the instruction of cognitive strategies for critical thinking.

We shall first explain in more detail our theoretical position and then we will present empirical data on values stimulation and teachers' instructional practice when combining value stimulation with critical thinking.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Value stimulation

From a sociological point of view (Apple, 1986) teachers cannot adopt a neutral attitude toward certain values. They always stimulate values they consider important for their students. They always try to stimulate the development of specific values in their students.

The values teachers find important for their students are expressed in the content of their instruction and in the way they guide the learning process. Teachers can express values implicitly but, by means of reflection, they can also be explicit about the values they express and the way they express them (Liston and Zeichner, 1991). Teachers can also make explicit for their students which values they express.

The constructivism paradigm in cognitive psychology states that students develop their own knowledge and insights (Grennan Brooks and Brooks, 1993; Prawatt, 1992). Students accommodate and assimilate the received knowledge and insights in their own structures of knowledge. Students design their own signification of meaning. A teacher tries to influence this process of signification of meaning by providing a content and, in particular, by his/her interaction with the students.

In education, a comparable learning strategy is used when attention is given to the development of values. Students develop their own values, they give their own signification of meaning, but teachers try to influence this process of signification. By doing this, teachers stimulate the development of specific values.

It is useful I think to make a clear distinction between teachers' and students' activities, that is, instruction and learning. Students construct their own values themselves. Teachers try to help students in this process, but in this they do not function neutrally. They try to stimulate the construction of specific values. In their interaction with the students, teachers want to stimulate the development of specific values, whereas students have to react to these values.

In speaking about the role of education in the development of certain values, most people use the concept of 'transfer of values'. According to this concept, education should

transmit certain values to students, this suggesting that values can be passed over. But both constructive psychology and critical pedagogy (Giroux, 1989) show that teachers cannot transfer values to their students, because students construct their own concepts of meaning and develop their own values. Teachers, however, can encourage students to develop certain values. They can try to influence the development of certain values by their students. Therefore we have introduced the concept of 'value stimulation'. Teachers can be asked which values they want to develop in their students, which values they propagate by means of didactic materials and educational behavior.

Learning critical thinking

A totally different approach in working with values is advocated by the 'critical thinking' movement. Central in their way of working with values is that students analyze their own point of view and the view points of other people on the value orientation bound to these points of view. Important Exponents of the 'critical thinking' movement are Ennis (1994) and Paul (1992). With these educational methods teachers try to teach students certain skills that enable them to clarify, communicate and make logical analyses of the view points. In these didactic approaches teachers' functioning is considered to be value-neutral.

In their review article Kennedy, Fisher and Ennis (1991) distinguish the following skills for 'critical thinking':

- identifying assumptions, both stated and unstated, both ones' own and others;
- clarifying, focusing, and staying relevant to the topic;
- understanding logic;
- judging sources, their reliability and credibility.

Besides skills disposities are important too:

- being open-minded;
- considerate of our people;
- being impartial;
- suspending judgement;
- taking a stance when warranted;
- questioning one's own view;
- using one's critical thinking skills.

Speaking of the 'critical movement' Ennis (1994) says that it is not in the first place a fixed curriculum used in many schools, but more a set of educational notions incorporated in the curriculum and in the pedagogical actions of teachers. With regard to 'moral development', Sockett (1992) comes to the same conclusion.

Criticizing 'critical thinking'

The criticism toward the 'critical thinking' movement is twofold: first it strongly appeals to a cognitive learning style (Kaplan 1991; Thayer-Bacon, 1993). The increase of care and

commitment to the subject is inadequately incorporated in the conceptual framework of teaching 'critical thinking'.

Another point of criticism is that 'critical thinking' stimulates relativism. Teachers do not explicitly express the values they find important for their students. Students get the impression that all values are of equal worth. This apparently value-neutral position of the teacher in teaching 'critical thinking' is necessary in that framework as students learn to formulate their own point of view. According to these critics, the effect is that students learn that view points are value-bound, but that because of the 'neutral' position of the teacher, they obtain no indications about what is 'good' and what is 'bad' (Sockett, 1992). This criticism comes mostly from people like Bloom (1987) who are concerned about the lost of traditional values.

From a more liberal position a reference is made to the postmodern age in which we are presently living. In the present society there are no longer any fixed values, traditional ideologies have lost their coherence and also, partly, their signification (Autio, Jaakkola and Ropo, 1994; Usher and Edwards, 1993). This postmodernist criticism could be right in that traditional ideologies are not that powerful anymore. In my opinion this does not mean that education does not have a pedagogical task anymore (see also, Beyer and Liston, 1992). Students still have to be socialized for the community. The society uses its socialization institutions to incorporate new members as part of the existing cultural politics. Education is still a powerful institution.

Perhaps the developments occurring in our society nowadays are less determined than before, yet our society must reproduce and transform itself. This process of reproduction and transformation represents both the inset and the effect of political and cultural struggle. In education, this struggle is reflected in the curriculum, in the educational goals of teachers and in educational practice (Giroux and Mc Laren, 1989). Teachers are part of this political and cultural struggle. As cultural politics, education implies not only the transfer of knowledge and the development of skills but also the development of values. When developing citizenship of their students teachers cannot remain neutral in this political and cultural struggle. Thus, 'critical thinking implies not only reading the word, but also reading the world' (Goodman, 1992, p. 159).

Beside these points of criticism referring to cognitivism and relativism I would like to add a third point. This point has been actually indicated in the beginning. Teachers cannot use a value-neutral way of teaching. In the interaction between teacher and student it is not possible for the teacher not to express certain values. Teachers express values in the selected curriculum documents, in the chosen examples and in their reaction to their students.

Realizing that teachers express certain values also makes it possible to think about the way in which teachers use these values in teaching, and which values they find important for their students. I think it is necessary to de-mystify this so-called value-neutral

thinking in speaking about the work of teachers. This way of thinking is still very strong in educational studies, being an expression of technological rationality.

Both 'critical thinking' and 'moral development' consist of notions related to students' learning activities, with the characteristic that a student develops his/her own values. Because both movements promote a value-neutral position for the teacher in pedagogical action there is, in my opinion, not enough focus on the values teachers find important for their students, on the way teachers express these values and, for interaction, on the value-level between teacher and student.

TEACHERS AND THE CURRICULUM

In analyzing the professional tasks of teachers in education we use the levels distinguished in the curriculum by Goodlad, Klein and Tye (1979). On the national political level, the level of the 'ideal curriculum' as Goodlad calls it, the pedagogical task of education means stimulating the commitment to society viewed as a community, and values which are accepted by the whole society like cooperation/solidarity/caring, equal rights/no-discrimination and concern for life and environment. Comparable lists of values can be found in American publications (see, for example, Huffman, 1994).

These lists look quite similar, yet there are important differentiations in the formulation. On the level of the ideological curriculum one notices already some differences, especially in the relation between individual interests and more social or collective responsibilities. In the Netherlands, probably as result of a long tradition of social-democratic and christian-democratic policy, there is more concern for cooperation, solidarity and social responsibilities than in the United States.

The values formulated at the level of the 'ideal curriculum' must be interpreted by each school, in accordance with their own school identity. At the level of the teaching process, within the framework of school identity, a teacher gives a more concrete interpretation of the pedagogical task on the political- and school level. At the distinguished levels there are always possibilities for differentiation in signification. When the values become part of educational practice significations can show clear differences.

Teacher, power and assessment

In education teachers have a great influence on the assessment of their students (Hargreaves, 1989). Because of this judging role of teachers there cannot be a power-free value communication between teachers and students, in which participants get involved in an equal way of communicating about values. Teachers may try to reduce the influence of sanctions in this communication, but the formal inequality in power between teachers and students remains. Students are more or less 'pressured' to take in consideration the values which are stimulated by the teachers. Students have to consider these values in their own

process of signification. Due to the formal power relations between teachers and students, the latter must make up their own mind about the values the teacher stimulates.

It is difficult to assess which values students actually develop. Educational literature frequently indicates the difficulty of assessing values because in education it is not easy to appeal values and these values can be pretended. These problems of educating and assessing values have also contributed to the dominant position of technical rationality in education (Veugelers, 1989). But the problems of educating and assessing are no arguments for not working explicitly on value development and not starting a pedagogical project in education.

TEACHERS AND VALUES THEY FIND IMPORTANT

The results of a study into the importance attached by teachers to stimulating and developing certain values will be presented here. We take the example of values regarding labor.

Social-normative qualifications regarding labor

The educational tasks of 'personal development' 'sociocultural education', and 'socioeconomic preparation' can be distinguished only analytically. In educational practice these tasks go together. The preparation of students for labor goes mainly together with their preparation for society. By preparing students for labor a contribution is also made to their personal development.

In preparing students for labor, teachers want to develop a qualification for labor. With regard to the required qualifications for labor, a distinction can be made between technical-instrumental and social-normative qualifications. Social-normative qualifications are the values and habits people need for labor. Hurrelmann (1975) divides the social-normative qualification for labor in social-regulative, motivational-normative and politico-normative elements. In this study, the motivational-normative and politico-normative elements were discerned in the following themes: 'motives in occupational choice', 'social organization of labor' (division of labor and unemployment) 'labor relations' and 'relations between education and labor'. A social-normative qualification for labor could be aimed at personal adaptation, personal emancipation and collective emancipation (See for similar positions, Carnoy and Levin, 1985 and Simon, Dippo and Schenke, 1991).

Methods and data sources

This study was achieved by means of a written questionnaire sent to 415 teachers in general secondary education and vocational education (Veugelers, 1993). It shows which values and value orientations teachers wish to develop in their students. The research instrument was a written questionnaire in which teachers had to indicate on an interval scale how much

importance they attached to each of the specified goals and how much attention they paid to each particular goal. Furthermore, they had to answer why they had chosen these goals. The school subjects comprised economics and practical subjects, social studies and career counselling. The questionnaire was sent to 694 teachers of which 415 (60%) responded (see for more details on methods and results Veugelers 1995a and 1995b).

Results

Results show that teachers do not only pass on knowledge and skills to their students, but they also stimulate them in developing certain values related to labor. The personal curriculum used by teachers, their interpretation of the formal curriculum includes goals related to the development of values related to labor. Teachers want to pass on specific values which are part of their 'pedagogical content knowledge'. Teachers' professional view is that they have a pedagogical task.

Results show that the type of school, the subject, personal characteristics, as well as the culture of the school, have an influence on the specific values teachers stimulate in their students. They also show that teachers inr interpretation of the formal curriculum includes goals related to the development of values related to labor. Teachers want to pass on specific values which are part of their 'pedagogical content knowledge'. Teachers' professional view is that they have a pedagogical task.

Results show that the type of school, the subject, personal characteristics, as well as the culture of the school, have an influence on the specific values teachers stimulate in their students. They also show that teachers in, but also the personal characteristics of the teacher are very important. The choices made by teachers are also affected by the culture of the school.

VALUE STIMULATION AND 'CRITICAL THINKING'

The first study showed that teachers want to stimulate the development of specific values, but what is their didactic approach? We are particularly interested in teaching and learning processes in which students are challenged to construct in an active way their own values, their own points of view. For that purpose we shall concentrate on teachers' role in combining teaching cognitive strategies for critical thinking and stimulating, as part of their pedagogical task, the development of specific values.

Learning 'critical thinking' and developing values by students

Let us first look at the learning process of students. In learning critical thinking students can acquire cognitive strategies for signification and they can also learn to regulate these learning processes. Learning to think critically can be seen as higher-order thinking in value development. Judging information is a central feature in this process. Kennedy, Fisher and

Ennis (1991) and Paul (1992) made long lists of cognitive strategies needed for critical thinking. As we are interested in the influence of values on critical thinking we selected some specific cognitive strategies:

- explore values/points of view
- analyze values on their value-orientation.
- make explicit the criteria for assessing value-orientations and use them for comparing value-orientations
- formulate or reformulate one's own values and points of view

We also added strategies for dialogue, because participating in a dialogue is a strong mean in learning critical thinking (Shor, 1992). So, we obtained the following reformulated cognitive strategies which are part of the learning process for critical thinking:

1 formulate one's own opinion
2 analyze which values are expressed in that opinion
3 formulate other opinions about the same topic and analyze which values are expressed in the other opinions
4 compare different opinions and the values expressed in them
5 have a dialogue about the opinions of others
6 have a dialogue about one's own opinion

Learning 'critical thinking' and value stimulation by teachers

When teachers teach students these cognitive strategies they also try to influence the development of values by their students. Teachers cannot teach these strategies in a value-neutral way.

For example, a teacher asks his/her students which are causes of unemployment (to explore values/points of view). Subsequently, the teacher asks which view on the relation between individuals and society is grounded in each cause (to analyze values on there value-orientation). Then, the teacher asks which are the criteria used by the student and by other people in opting for a certain value-orientation (to make explicit and compare criteria).

With all the mentioned cognitive strategies the values teachers want to develop in their students become clear. For instance, when exploring, a teacher mentions causes his/her student has not mentioned yet. Especially the causes the teacher finds important are expressed.

A comparable process takes place in analyzing values on their orientation. The teacher indicates orientations that were not mentioned by the students, pointing to 'logical' failings in the analysis, and shows implicitly (and sometimes explicitly) which analyses and values he appreciates. In making values explicit and comparing criteria teachers cannot function in a value-neutral way either.

Most of the times, teachers will show the values they find important for their students

implicitly. In their content of instruction, personal curriculum and didactic methods teachers express the values they find important. However, teachers can also work more explicitly on value-stimulation by stimulating quite clearly and overtly certain values. In their educational practice, when they pay attention to the development of values, teachers will concentrate on teaching cognitive strategies, strategies for critical thinking. But even then, teachers will show which values they find important for their students. The cognitive strategies teachers want to teach to their students are 'colored' by the values they find important for their students.

We distinguish four instruction strategies in teaching value-loaded topics:

1 the teacher tries not to express his own values
2 the teacher makes explicit the values he/she finds important
3 the teacher stresses differences in values without expressing the values he/she finds important
4 the teacher indicates differences in values, but also expresses the values he/she finds important

This does not mean that students have to adopt these values, but due to the power relations in education, students have to approach these values in a serious way. They have to make up their mind about the values their teachers stimulate.

We are interested in the way in which these instruction strategies influence the learning process of the students, the construction of their own opinions.

Research on learning critical thinking and value stimulation

The second study we are working on now examines more directly the connection between stimulating certain values by teachers and students' learning how to be critical. We started by gathering qualitative data. Later on we will carry out some case-studies in which we will use different research techniques (interviews, questionnaires, observations). Teachers from five schools of general secondary education participate now in the first qualitative stage of this study.

Interviews were mainly focused on teachers' voices about the way they see their task in developing certain values in their students. In the reports concerning their educational practice teachers have to indicate which of the above- mentioned cognitive strategies they teach and in which way values are expressed in their teaching. They have to describe their educational practice and their students' behavior, and particularly their interaction with their students. Besides providing valuable data, this qualitative research which gives meaning to teachers' voices must contribute to the improvement of the research instruments.

The research questions in this study are as follows:

1. *cognitive strategies for learning critical thinking*: How do teachers teach their students

to develop strategies for analyzing values and to formulate opinions based on critical thinking?

2. *instruction strategy with regard to values*: How are teachers' values expressed in their didactic activities when teaching cognitive strategies for critical thinking? Which instruction strategy are teachers using? How do teachers analyze values on underlying value orientation/outlook on society?

3. *interaction/dialogue about values*: How does the interaction between students' and teachers' values take place when students learn cognitive strategies for critical thinking, whereby interaction is regarded as a process of signification?

4. *pedagogical task of teachers*: How do teachers react to values expressed by their students when they have no sympathy or understanding for these values?

5. *construction of meaning by students*: What do students think about the way teachers express their values? What do they think about learning cognitive strategies for critical thinking? Which cognitive strategies do they learn and which values/opinions do they develop?

To answer these questions we shall particularly focus on the influence of teaching different cognitive strategies, and on different ways of expressing values by teachers.

Different ways of expressing values

We shall now give some examples showing how the teachers participating in our study speak about the way in which they express their values when teaching cognitive strategies for critical thinking. It are examples of instruction strategies.

The teacher tries not to express his own values

> 'In the educational program there is a discussion about opinions like "you live for working or you live for living". In groups, students have to think about these opinions and search arguments that underlie the opinions. As a teacher I listen and look if the arguments fit the opinion. It is my choice not to intervene. My values are already often implicitly and explicitly part of the curriculum.'

This teacher does not want to express his own values now, but he is aware of the fact that he already often expresses his values and that, in general, students know what his opinion is.

When analyzing this episode the teacher admitted that although he was just judging the quality of the arguments this judgement was not an objective way of assessment, but a subjective one. For example, is the quality of the arguments provided by those who are *for* a new highway better than the *con* arguments? The quality can only be judged when these arguments are assessed in the context of a value orientation.

Pattern in instructional strategies

Some teachers affirm that there is a pattern in the way they use instructional strategies when teaching value-loaded topics: they mostly start by

- not expressing their own values

then

- stress differences in values without expressing the values they find important

and end with

- the values they find important.

They start this pattern by avoiding to express certain values in order to give students the opportunity to formulate their own opinions, then they want to be sure that different opinions are taken into consideration. They end by indicating the values they find important themselves.

The teacher indicates differences in values, but also express the values he/ she finds important

Another noticed strategy is that teachers confront students with certain values they find important for them. Students are invited to express their own points of view about those opinions/values. A example:

> 'We are now talking about choosing a continuing study in higher education. A student said "I want to become a historian, but there are not enough jobs, so I don't choose this study". As a teacher I did not agree with this opinion. I asked the other students "What do you think about this opinion?"
>
> I point out the contradiction, and often I give my own opinion to the students asking them to come with their own points of view about my opinion next week. For example, I told a student that I thought he would become a good teacher. I asked him to think about it and give me all his pros and cons.
>
> Students find me very confronting. They appreciate this, but you can only do this when there is a good atmosphere between teacher and students.'

More teachers say that they are quite clear in expressing their opinions and ask students to use cognitive strategies for critical thinking in formulating their own opinions. In using these strategies they have to react to the opinion of the teacher.

Stimulating values and continuing the dialogue

Teachers must teach students cognitive strategies, stimulate specific values as part of their pedagogical task and, at the same time, they must show some respect for students' own opinions in consideration of the students' feeling of self-respect and of teachers' acceptance of cultural differences. The balance between these three educational tasks is not easy for teachers. Some examples:

- 'You are continuously pushing, in a really personal way. You watch and take care of the limits of your interventions.'
- 'In the values of others you look for some space that is open for change. These values sometimes clash with your own values. You try to make opinions debatable and, at the same time, respect others' opinions.'
- The approach is to try to respect values, but also to be clear in what you think, the most important thing is to keep the dialogue open.'

DISCUSSION

In the interaction of values in the classroom teachers act both as supervisors and participants. They pay their own contribution to the content. But because of their pedagogic authority this contribution cannot be compared to that of their students (Lisman, 1991; Van Manen, 1994). Teachers have a greater influence on the curriculum. Their values are ingrained in educational matters and also in the pedagogical relations which, together, constitute the concept of education. As we have seen, teachers cannot remain neutral with regard to expressing certain values in their teaching. Stimulating certain values is characteristic of their profession. Therefore, we think, it is advisable to be aware of the values teachers want to develop in their students. For teachers this means that they have to make more explicit which values are included in their 'pedagogical content knowledge'. When thinking about their work teachers should not only reflect upon their interaction with their students, but also upon the values that govern their teaching (Liston and Zeichner, 1992; Veugelers and Zijlstra, 1995).

In teaching their students critical thinking skills teachers do not take up a neutral position but here also they stimulate certain values. Therefore, we think it is important to examine what teachers do when they try to develop critical thinking skills in their students and at the same time wishing to develop certain values. In one and the same process teachers try to continue the dialogue with their students, to change certain values, to teach them how to analyze certain values on their orientation and to evaluate this orientation on its significance in itself.

Recently, Walters (1994) has analyzed the development of the critical thinking movement. The 'first wave' of critical thinkers focused on logical analysis, whereas the 'second wave' focused on the ideological position of the thinker i.e., critical thinking was understood contextually. McLaren (1994) argues for a 'third wave' which sees reasoning as a sociopolitical practice, as part of politics of social justice. We hope that our attempt to develop a perspective for a didactic approach in which students' learning strategies are influenced by the instruction in which teachers stimulate the development of specific values, can contribute to this politics of justice.

REFERENCES

Apple, M.W. (1986) *Teachers and texts* (New York, Routledge and Kegan).

Autio, T. Jaakkola, R. and Ropo, E. (1994) Postmodern Order and a Curriculum, From Transmission to Transformation. Paper presented at the *ECUNET-conference*, August 1994, Enschede, the Netherlands.

Beyer, L.E. and Liston, D.P. (1992), Disourse or Moral Action, A Critique of Postmodernism, in: *Educational Theory*, 42, nr.4, pp. 371-393.

Bloom, A. (1987) The closing of the American mind (New York, Simon and Schuster).

Carnoy, M. and Levin, H.M. (1985) *Schooling and work in the democratic state*. (Stanford, Stanford University Press).

Edwards, L., Munn, P. and Fogelman, K. (1994) *Education for citizenship* (Lisse, Swets and Zeitlinger).

Ennis, R.H. (1994) Critical Thinking Dispositions: Theoretical and Practical Considerations in their Delineation, Endorsement, and Assessment. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the *American Educational Research Association*, New Orleans, April 1994.

Giroux, H.A. (1989) *Schooling for democracy* (Londen, Routledge).

Giroux, H.A. and McLaren, P.L. (eds.) (1989) *Critical pedagogy, the state and cultural struggle* (New York, Suny).

Giroux, H.A., and Purpel, D. (1983) *The Hidden Curriculum and Moral Education*. Berkeley, McCutchan.

Goodlad, J.I., Klein, M.F. and Tye, K.A. (1979) The Domains of Curriculum and their Study, in: J.I. Goodlad (eds.) *Curriculum Inquiry* (New York, McGraw-Hill).

Goodman, J. (1992) Elementary Schooling for Critical Democracy (New York, Suny).

Grennan Brooks, J. and Brooks, M.G. (1993) *In Search of Understanding, The Case for Constructivist Classrooms* (ASCD, Alexandria).

Gudmundsdottir, S. (1990) Values in Pedagogical Content Knowledge, in: *Journal of Teacher Education*, 3, pp. 44-52.

Hargreaves, A. (1989) *Curriculum and Assessment Reform* (Milton Keynes, Open University Press).

Hout-Wolters, B.H.A.M. (1992) *Cognitieve Strategieën als Onderwijsdoel*. Groningen, Wolters-Noordhoff.

Huffman, H.A. (1994) *Developing a Character Education Program* (ASCD, Alexandria).

Hurrelmann, K. (1975) *Erziehungssystem und Gesellschaft* (Reinbeck, Rowohlt).

Kaplan, L.D. (1991) The Failure of the Critical Thinking Movement, in: *Educational Theory, 4*, pp. 361-370.

Kennedy, M., Fisher, M.B. and Ennis, R.H. (1991) Critical Thinking: Literature Review and Needed Research, in: Idol, L and Fly Jones, B. (eds.) *Educational Values and Cognitive Instruction: Implicaties for reform* (Hilsdale, Lawrence Erlbaum).

Lisman, C.D. (1991) A Critical Review of the Moral Dimensions of Teaching, in: *Educational Theory, 2*, pp. 227-234.

Liston, D.P, and Zeichner, K.M. (1991) *Teacher Education and the Social Conditions of Schooling* (New York, Routledge).

Manen, M. van (1994) Pedagogy, Virtue and Narrative Identity in Education, in: *Curriculum Inquiry*, vol. 24, nr. 2.

Marzano, R.J. (1992) *A Different Kind of Classroom. Teaching with dimensions of learning (ASCD, Alexandria)*.

McLaren, P.L. (1994) Foreword: Critical Thinking as a Political Project, in: Walters, K.S. *Re-Thinking Reason, New Perspectives in Critical Thinking*. (Albany, State Unuversity of New York Press).

Oser, F.K. (1994) Moral Perspectives on Teaching. In: *Review of Research in Education*, 20, pp. 57-128.

Paul, R.W. (1992) *Critical Thinking, What Every Person Needs to Survive in a Rapidly Changing World* (Santa Rosa, The Foundation for Critical Thinking).

Power, F.C., Higgins, A. and Kohlberg, L. *Lawrence Kohlberg's Approach to Moral Education* (New York, Columbia University Press).

Prawatt, J. (1992) Teachers' Beliefs about Teaching and Learning: a Constructivist Perspective, in: *American Journal of Education*, 100, pp. 354-395.

Raths, L., Harmin, M. and Simon, S. (1966) *Values and Teaching* (Ohio, Columbus).

Simon, R.I., Dippo, D. and Schenke, A. (1991) *Learning Work: A Critical Pedagogy of Work Education* (New York, Bergin & Garvey).

Shor, I. (1992) *Empowering Education. Critical Teaching for Social Change* (Chicago, University of Chicago Press).

Sockett, H. (1992) The Moral Aspects of the Curriculum, in: Jackson, P.W., eds. *Handbook of Research on Curriculum*. (New York, MacMillan) pp. 543-569.

Usher R. and Edwards, R. (1994) *Postmodernism and Education* (London, Routledge).

Thayer-Bacon, B.J. (1993) Caring and its Relation to Critical Thinking, in: *Educational Theory*, 43, 3, pp. 323-340.

Veugelers, W. (1989) The Modular Approach in the Netherlands, Rationalities in the Relationship between Education and Labor, in: Voorbach, J.T. and Prick, L.G.M., *Teacher Education 5. Research and Developments on Teacher Education in the Netherlands* ('s Gravenhage, SVO).

Veugelers, W. (1993) *Pedagogische Opdracht en Arbeid* (Amsterdam, Thesis Publishers).

Veugelers, W. (1995a) Teachers and Value regarding Labour, in: *Curriculum Studies*, 2, in print.

Veugelers, W. (1995b) Vocational Education and Values regarding Labor. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the *American Educational Research Association*, San Francisco, April 1995.

Veugelers, W. and Zijlstra, H. (1995). Learning Together: In-Service Education in Networks of Schools, in: *British Journal of In-Service Education*, in print.